

01213

1989/08/13

01/ UNCLAS

BEIJING 22327

VZCZCBJI *
 OO RUEHIA RUEHC RUEADWW RUEHGZ RUEHHK RUMJSA
 RUEHSH
 DE RUEHEJ #2327/01 225 **
 ZNR UUUUU ZZH
 O 130723Z AUG 89
 FM AMEMBASSY BEIJING
 TO RUEHIA / USIA WASHDC IMMEDIATE 9284
 RUEHC / SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 6097
 RUEADWW / WHITEHOUSE WASHDC IMMEDIATE
 RUEHGZ / AMCONSUL GUANGZHOU IMMEDIATE 7942
 RUEHHK / AMCONSUL HONG KONG IMMEDIATE 4238
 RUMJSA / AMCONSUL SHANGHAI IMMEDIATE 9629
 RUEHSH / AMCONSUL SHENYANG IMMEDIATE 7459
 ZEN/AMCONSUL CHENGDU (BY TELETYPE)

PT
 UNCLAS SECTION 01 OF * BEIJING 22327

USIA

USIA FOR FA, CL, VOA

STATE FOR EAP/P, EAP/CM

F.O. 12356: N/A
 SUBJECT: SENATOR RUDMAN'S PRESS CONFERENCE IN
 BEIJING ON AUGUST 12, 1989: FULL TEXT.

1. SENATOR WARREN RUDMAN HELD A USIS-ORGANIZED PRESS
 CONFERENCE AT THE GREAT WALL SHERATON HOTEL IN
 BEIJING AT 1830 SATURDAY, AUGUST 12TH. THERE FOLLOWS
 THE FULL TEXT OF HIS COMMENTS AND FOLLOWING QSA.
 THREE U.S. NETWORKS TAPED AND MOST OF THE 25 MEDIA
 BUREAUS IN BEIJING WERE REPRESENTED AT THE 35-MINUTE
 EXCHANGE.

(BEGIN TEXT) SENATOR RUDMAN: I AM DELIGHTED TO MEET
 WITH YOU. I REALLY HADN'T PLANNED IT, BUT THERE HAD
 BEEN SO MUCH INTEREST, THERE MUST BE VERY SLOW NEWS
 IN BEIJING TO GET THIS KIND OF A TURNOUT. BUT LET ME
 SAY THAT, NUMBER ONE, IT WILL BE ON THE RECORD. AND
 I WILL NOT DISCUSS ANYTHING ON BACKGROUND WITH ANY OF
 YOU AFTERWARDS. THAT IS MY POLICY IN WASHINGTON:
 THAT IS MY POLICY HERE. AND THERE IS SOMETHING ELSE
 YOU SHOULD KNOW. I DON'T INTEND TO DISCUSS WITH YOU
 WITH ANY SPECIFICITY WHAT ANY OF THE CHINESE LEADERS
 I MET WITH TODAY SAID TO ME. I DON'T INTEND TO DO

THAT. YOU MAY NOT LIKE THAT, BUT NO MATTER HOW YOU
 ASK IT, I DON'T INTEND TO DO THAT. I WILL BE VERY
 PLEASED TO TELL YOU WHAT I TOLD THEM AND ANYTHING
 ELSE THAT I CAN ANSWER.

FOR THOSE OF YOU WHO DON'T COVER WASHINGTON, I AM ON
 THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE. I SERVE ON BOTH
 DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS AND THE FOREIGN OPERATIONS
 SUBCOMMITTEE. AND I GET VERY INVOLVED IN BOTH OF
 THOSE SUBCOMMITTEES IN THESE KINDS OF EVENTS.

CLASS: UNCLASSIFIED
 CHRG: USIS 11/23/89
 APPRV: USIS:PAO:MHRUSSELL
 DEFTD: USIS:PAO:MHRUSSELL
 CLEAR: USIS:DPAO:KAYATES
 DISTR: PSC-2 AMR DCM
 PCL ECON SST
 CONS FCS DAO
 AGR CHENG CHRO

IS/IFPC/CDR *W* Date: *11/27/90*

DEPARTMENT OF STATE	RELEASE	() DECLASSIFY	TS authority to: () S or () DOWNGRADE IS to () S or
	EXCISE	() DECLASSIFY	
	DENY	IN PART	
	DELETE Non-Responsive Info		
FOIA Exemptions			

UNCLAS

BEIJING 22327

THE UNITED STATES, AND I EXPECT IF ALL GOES AS PLANNED, HE WILL BE IN HIS POST SOMETIME BY EARLY FALL. THAT WAS MOST IMPORTANT TO BE ABLE TO TALK TO HIM IN DETAIL ABOUT WHAT HE WILL FACE IN TERMS OF CONGRESS AND, I THINK, IN THE COUNTRY IN GENERAL.

Q. DID YOU GET A TOUR OF TIANANMEN SQUARE?

A. WE DROVE IN THROUGH TIANANMEN SQUARE. I DIDN'T TAKE A WALKING TOUR OF IT. I DIDN'T ASK FOR ONE. THE ONLY SIGHT-SEEING I DID IS THAT I DID GET A CHANCE TO GO THROUGH THE FORBIDDEN CITY THIS MORNING FOR A BRIEF TIME AND THEN AS WE GOT TO THE GREAT WALL, BECAUSE WAN LI WAS IN THE MIDST OF A MAJOR MEETING, WE DID GET A TOUR THERE. OTHER THAN THAT, NO.

Q. CAN YOU ENUMERATE FOR US THE POINTS THAT YOU DID MAKE IN YOUR MEETING WITH MR. WAN LI. IF YOU CAN'T GIVE US THE SPECIFICS OF HIS RESPONSE, WILL YOU GIVE US SOME SENSE OF THE SPIRIT IN WHICH THEY WERE RECEIVED?

A. I WILL BE HAPPY TO TELL YOU WHAT I SAID TO BOTH GENTLEMEN AND (WHAT I SAID) WAS FAIRLY CORRECT. I POINTED OUT, FIRST, THAT I THINK THAT MOST MEMBERS OF CONGRESS DO AGREE WITH PRESIDENT BUSH THAT THIS RELATIONSHIP IS VERY IMPORTANT: FOR STRATEGIC REASONS, FOR ECONOMIC REASONS, AND FOR REASONS OF WHAT IS HAPPENING IN THE WORLD AROUND US PARTICULARLY IN EASTERN EUROPE AND THE SOVIET UNION. IT IS A RELATIONSHIP WHICH IS IMPORTANT, AND I WANTED HIM TO UNDERSTAND THAT THERE IS NO BACKING OFF THE VIEW OF ITS IMPORTANCE. THAT WAS THE FIRST POINT.

THE SECOND POINT WAS THAT ALTHOUGH THERE HAS BEEN MUCH CRITICISM IN THE CHINESE PRESS HERE ABOUT THE CONGRESS AND THE FACT THAT THE CONGRESS HAS TAKEN THE ACTION THAT IT HAS TAKEN-- ALTHOUGH NONE OF IT IS LAW AT THIS POINT--THAT IS A REALITY OF AMERICAN POLITICS. THE PRESIDENT'S POSITION IS A MODEST ONE COMPARED TO THE POSITION TAKEN BY SOME PEOPLE IN CONGRESS. SOME WOULD ADVOCATE A FAR STRICTER POSITION AND MANY A SOMEWHAT STRICTER POSITION IN TERMS OF SANCTIONS, TRADE AND SO FORTH.

AND THEN I THOUGHT IT WAS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT FOR HIM TO UNDERSTAND THAT THERE WAS A DEEP FEELING IN THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS ABOUT WHAT HAPPENED HERE IN JUNE, AND AS MUCH AS THEY WOULD LIKE TO CRITICIZE US FOR MEDDLING IN THEIR INTERNAL AFFAIRS, THAT IT WASN'T MEDDLING AT ALL. THAT THEY HAVE EVERY RIGHT TO DO WHAT THEY WANT IN THIS COUNTRY. THIS COUNTRY IS GOVERNED BY THEIR GOVERNMENT NOT BY OURS, AND THEY CAN DO WHAT THEY WISH TO DO. WE HAVE NO CONTROL OVER THAT.

BUT THE POINT I MADE WAS THAT, TO THE EXTENT THAT

PRESS HAD BEEN QUITE FAVORABLE TO THIS GOVERNMENT AND TO THIS COUNTRY AND THERE HAD BEEN MANY INTERESTING DOCUMENTARIES, PERIODICAL REPORTS, AND NEWS REPORTS AND WIRE SERVICE STORES THAT ESSENTIALLY TALKED ABOUT THE EMERGENCE OF A FREER ECONOMY HERE AND ALL THE THINGS THAT WERE HAPPENING. AND IN MANY CASES COMPARING THEM TO THE SOVIET UNION IN TERMS OF THE RELATIVE GAINS IN THE ECONOMY.

CERTAINLY THEY COULD NOT TAKE THE POSITION THAT THE WORLD PRESS WAS HOSTILE TO THEM AT THAT TIME. AND YET THE REPORTING WHICH WE ALL SAW WITH OUR OWN EYES WAS SUCH THAT IT WAS IMPOSSIBLE TO DENY THE REALITY OF SOME THINGS THAT HAPPENED HERE. I DIDN'T WANT TO GET IN AN ARGUMENT WITH THEM ABOUT WHAT HAPPENED AND WHAT DIDN'T HAPPEN. I KNOW WHAT WE SAW AND I KNOW THE IMPACT ON THE AMERICAN PEOPLE. TO DENY ITS EXISTENCE REALLY IS COUNTER-PRODUCTIVE. WE OUGHT TO LOOK AHEAD, NOT BACK AT THIS POINT. THAT IS A COMPLETE ANSWER TO YOUR QUESTION.

Q. WELL, EXCEPT FOR THE SECOND PART OF MY QUESTION, WHICH WAS (ABOUT THE) KIND OF SPIRIT THAT WAS RECEIVED IN?

A. IT WAS RECEIVED IN VERY GOOD SPIRIT. I THINK THAT BOTH OF THEM WERE HONESTLY DELIGHTED THAT SOMEONE FROM THE UNITED STATES SENATE WANTED TO SIT AND TALK WITH THEM AND EXPLAIN OUR VIEWS. OBVIOUSLY, THEIR COLLECTIVE--NOT OF JUST THESE TWO GENTLEMEN BUT THEIR COLLECTIVE RESTATEMENT OF THOSE EVENTS IS OBVIOUSLY DIFFERENT FROM OUR OWN. BUT I DON'T HAVE TO TELL YOU THAT, BECAUSE YOU ARE HERE AND YOU READ THE PRESS. YOU SEE WHAT THEY SAY PUBLICLY, AND I DID NOT HEAR ANYTHING DIFFERENT FROM THAT. BUT, I WOULD SAY THAT THE MEETINGS WERE CORDIAL. THEY WERE VERY FRANK. THEY KNEW I WAS HERE TO STATE SOME POSITIONS AS AN INDIVIDUAL SENATOR. I SPEAK ONLY FOR MYSELF, BUT I THINK THE POSITIONS I ESPOUSE DO REFLECT THE VIEWS OF MANY I SERVE WITH.

Q. IF THEY GAVE YOU THE OFFICIAL LINE, AND NOT MUCH ELSE, WHAT MAKES YOU THINK THAT THEY UNDERSTAND THE FEELINGS OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE?

A. I DIDN'T SAY THAT I THOUGHT THEY DID. YOU JUST ASSUMED THAT.

Q. YOU DID NOT SAY THAT THERE WAS AN UNDERSTANDING ON THEIR PART OF WHAT WENT ON IN THE UNITED STATES?

A. I SAID THAT I TRIED TO CONVEY TO THEM AN UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT GOES ON IN THE UNITED STATES. I CANNOT ASSESS THE IMPACT OF MY STATEMENTS ON THEIR MINDS. I THINK THAT I SPOKE VERY CLEARLY. WE HAD VERY GOOD INTERPRETERS, MY WORDS WERE CAREFULLY CHOSEN, AND THEY WILL OBVIOUSLY HEED THEM OR NOT HEED THEM. BUT I DARESAY THAT THEY WILL BE REINFORCED BY

ABOUT WHAT THEIR PLANS ARE. NOR DID I ASK. I DID NOT THINK THAT WAS MY POSITION. YOU KNOW, I WANT TO MAKE SOMETHING CLEAR. IN MY VIEW, ONLY THE PRESIDENT AND HIS REPRESENTATIVE, THE AMBASSADOR CAN (A) NEGOTIATE FOR THE UNITED STATES, OR (B) GIVE ASSURANCES FOR THE UNITED STATES. MY PURPOSE WAS TOTALLY DIFFERENT.

Q. DID THE SUBJECT OF FANG LIZHI COME UP AT ALL?

A. I DID NOT DISCUSS THAT SUBJECT.

Q. DID YOU SEE HIM?

A. I AM NOT KNOWLEDGEABLE ON THAT SUBJECT AND I HAVE NO COMMENT ABOUT THAT SUBJECT.

Q. DID YOU SEE HIM?

A. I HAVE NO COMMENT ABOUT THAT SUBJECT AT ALL.

Q. SENATOR, YOU SAID THAT YOU WEREN'T HERE TO NEGOTIATE OR ANYTHING ELSE. THE CHINESE VERY OFTEN--WHETHER IT IS INTENDED OR NOT--RECEIVE MIXED SIGNALS FROM THE DIFFERENT BRANCHES OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT, WHETHER IT IS THE LEGISLATIVE OR THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH. WHAT WAS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR MEETING WITH WAN LI AND AMBASSADOR ZHU, AND IS IT POSSIBLE THAT THEY MIGHT RECEIVE MORE MIXED SIGNALS IF WHAT YOU TELL THEM IS DIFFERENT FROM WHAT THEY ARE BEING TOLD OFFICIALLY FROM EITHER THE GOVERNMENT IN WASHINGTON OR FROM HERE?

A. I CAN ASSURE YOU THAT WHAT I TOLD THEM WAS NOT ANY DIFFERENT THAN WHAT THEY HEARD FROM THE GOVERNMENT IN WASHINGTON, EXCEPT TO GIVE THEM A CONGRESSIONAL PERSPECTIVE. I WOULD POINT OUT TO YOU THAT I WAS ONE OF THE TEN IN THAT 31-12 VOTE WHO TRULY BELIEVED THE PRESIDENT. THIS PRESIDENT IS AN EXPERT IN THIS AREA. HE HAS EXCELLENT ADVICE. WE HAVE A FIRST-RATE AMBASSADOR HERE. I'M VERY IMPRESSED WITH THE STAFF OF THIS EMBASSY AND THEIR KNOWLEDGE OF WHAT IS GOING ON HERE. AND I WOULD SIMPLY SAY THAT I GAVE THEM THAT WHICH I AM PROPERLY EQUIPPED TO GIVE THEM: A CONGRESSIONAL PERSPECTIVE.

NOW, ON YOUR POINT ABOUT MIXED SIGNALS. YOU'RE QUITE RIGHT. THE WHOLE WORLD OCCASIONALLY GETS MIXED SIGNALS FROM THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT. THAT IS OUR GOVERNMENT. WE HAVE THREE BRANCHES AND TWO ARE INVOLVED IN POLICY. THE PRESIDENT AND THE CONGRESS. WE OFTEN HAVE MIXED SIGNALS COMING OUT OF WASHINGTON IN THE AREA OF TRADE AND IN THE AREA OF DEFENSE POLICY. BUT IN THIS INSTANCE, I DO NOT THINK THE SIGNALS HAVE BEEN MIXED AT ALL.

AS A MATTER OF FACT, I THINK THE PRESIDENT HAS SET FORTH THE POLICY CORRECTLY. I SUPPORT IT. IT

I WOULD GET. I WAS NOT IN THERE FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONFRONTATION OR ACCUSATION. I MEAN, THAT'S EASY TO DO, BUT THAT'S NOT PRODUCTIVE.

Q. WELL, LET ME REPEAT THE OTHER PART OF THE QUESTION (ABOUT THE ACTUAL REASON FOR SEN. RUDMAN'S TRIP TO CHINA.).

A. WELL, I THOUGHT I MADE IT CLEAR, BUT I WILL TRY ONE MORE TIME. THERE HAS BEEN AMPLE EVIDENCE FROM READING THE CHINESE PRESS THAT THEY DON'T TRULY UNDERSTAND THE ROLE OF THE AMERICAN CONGRESS IN THESE ISSUES. AND THEY OUGHT TO UNDERSTAND VERY CLEARLY THAT, IF CERTAIN THINGS DON'T CHANGE HERE AND IF THERE IS ANY REPEAT OF SOME OF THOSE EVENTS, I WOULD EXPECT CONGRESS TO REACT RATHER VIGOROUSLY.

AND LET ME AGAIN EMPHASIZE TO YOU THAT THE ACTIVITY OF THE CHINESE STUDENTS IN OUR COUNTRY - IN MY OWN STATE THOSE WHO ATTEND SOME OF THE INSTITUTIONS IN OUR STATE AND ADJOINING STATES - HAS BEEN VERY ACTIVE. WE NOT ONLY GET INFORMATION IN GOVERNMENT FROM ABOUT WHAT IS GOING ON HERE FROM THE MEDIA AND FROM OUR EMBASSY, BUT MANY OF THESE STUDENTS STILL HAVE VERY ADEQUATE COMMUNICATIONS HERE. I MADE IT VERY CLEAR TO (THOSE WITH WHOM I MET) THAT THESE STUDENTS IN AMERICA HAVE REALLY GOT THE ATTENTION OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE BECAUSE THEY ARE VERY FINE YOUNG PEOPLE. THEY ARE DILIGENT STUDENTS, AND THEY REALLY FIT WELL WITHIN OUR SOCIETY. THEY DO EXTRAORDINARILY WELL IN THEIR ACADEMICS. THEY ARE LISTENED TO, AND THE AMERICAN STUDENT MOVEMENT IS PICKING (THEIR) CRY UP. SO I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT TO UNDERSTAND THAT WE GET AFFECTED BY THINGS LIKE THAT. THAT WAS THE PURPOSE.

Q. IF I UNDERSTOOD YOU CORRECTLY A MINUTE AGO, YOU SAID THAT YOU VOTED WITH THE MINORITY.

A. I DID. THAT WAS A SENSE OF THE SENATE VOTE.

Q. COULD YOU JUST REPEAT A MOMENT WHAT THE SENSE OF THAT RESOLUTION WAS AND WHY YOU VOTED? AND THE VOTE WAS 80 OR 81 TO 10?

A. 81 TO 10. AND THE HOUSE VOTE WAS 418 TO 2. THE HOUSE VOTE WAS MUCH MORE STRINGENT. IF YOU WANT THE SPECIFICS, THE EMBASSY HAS ALL THAT. AS I RECALL, THAT PARTICULAR LEGISLATION IN THE HOUSE WAS TRULY (STRONG?) IN NATURE AND WOULD HAVE DONE SOME THINGS WITH SANCTIONS IN AN AFFIRMATIVE WAY. OBVIOUSLY, IT WOULD HAVE TO GO TO THE SENATE AND GET THE CONFERENCE TO CONSULT, BUT I DON'T EXPECT IT WILL EVER BECOME LAW.

SO THE SENATE RESOLUTION - WHICH WAS A MITCHELL-DOLE SENSE OF THE SENATE RESOLUTION - ESSENTIALLY SAID TO THE PRESIDENT "WE THINK THAT MAYBE YOU HAVEN'T GONE

CHINESE POLICY AND BEHAVIOR IN ANY WAY?

7

A. I AM NOT SO ARROGANT AS TO THINK THAT I COULD EVER CHANGE ANYTHING. BUT I WOULD SAY THAT I BELIEVE FROM THE NATURE OF THESE CONVERSATIONS - AND I MIGHT ADD (THAT) ONE LASTED CLOSE TO, I THINK, TWO HOURS AND THE OTHER ONE AN HOUR AND A HALF, AND THERE WERE A NUMBER OF PEOPLE THERE - AND FROM THE TYPE OF RESPONSES AND QUESTIONS I RECEIVED BACK, REALLY PLUMBING THE DEPTHS OF SOME OF THE THINGS THAT I HAVE SAID, THAT IT WILL BE PART OF THE INFORMATION THEY WILL ABSORB IN TERMS OF WHAT THEY WILL DO WITH THEIR POLICY GENERALLY. BUT A VISIT BY ITSELF WON'T CHANGE ANYTHING. I DO THINK THAT THE MEETING WITH THE AMBASSADOR-DESIGNATE WAS VERY, VERY USEFUL BECAUSE I HAVE GIVEN HIM A VERY GOOD BRIEFING ON WHAT TO EXPECT WHEN HE GETS TO THE CAPITAL.

Q. SENATOR, PRESIDENT BUSH ORDERED THE SUSPENSION OF HIGH LEVEL VISITS AND EXCHANGES. I TAKE IT THAT YOU DON'T THINK YOUR VISIT HERE VIOLATES THAT?

A. OH NO. I KNOW IT DOESN'T. I OBVIOUSLY DISCUSSED THIS TRIP WITH THE WHITE HOUSE IN DETAIL BEFORE I LEFT. THAT (SUSPENSION) RELATES TO THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT. MEMBERS OF THE CONGRESS, UNLESS THERE IS A SPECIFIC TRAVEL BAN BY THE STATE DEPARTMENT, ARE FREE TO GO WHERE THEY WISH. AS A MATTER OF FACT, I WOULD SAY, THAT THERE ARE A LOT MORE PLEASANT PLACES TO GO AT THIS TIME. IT'S (LAUGHING) NICE TO GO TO THE PARIS AIR SHOW AND THE TULIP FESTIVAL IN AMSTERDAM. BUT OCCASIONALLY, I THINK MEMBERS OF THE SENATE OUGHT TO GO TO PLACES WHERE THINGS AREN'T SO PLEASANT. I THINK MAYBE IT MIGHT BE MORE CONSTRUCTIVE. I HOPE THIS WAS.

Q. DO YOU THINK THAT THE SUSPENSION OF VISITS OUGHT TO REMAIN IN FORCE, OR DO YOU...?

A. I'M NOT GOING TO SECOND-GUESS THE PRESIDENT. THERE IS A LOT GOING ON DIPLOMATICALLY. A LOT OF DISCUSSIONS ON, AS YOU KNOW, OUR DEFENDENTS. THEY ARE COMING BACK, I BELIEVE, ON MONDAY. IS THAT CORRECT? HOPEFULLY SOME THINGS (LIKE THIS) CAN OCCUR. BUT NO. I JUST DON'T INTEND TO GIVE THE PRESIDENT ADVICE PUBLICLY. IF I FEEL STRONGLY ABOUT SOMETHING, I'LL CALL HIM UP AND TELL HIM.

Q. DO YOU THINK THAT WHAT HAS HAPPENED IN CHINA HAS AFFECTED YOUR VIEWS TOWARDS HONG KONG OR TAIWAN? DO YOU THINK THE UNITED STATES SHOULD (GIVE EXTRA SUPPORT TO ?) HONG KONG, FOR EXAMPLE?

A. I THINK IT IS PROBABLY TOO EARLY TO REACH THOSE KINDS OF CONCLUSIONS. I THINK THAT ONE OF THE PROBLEMS IN THIS WORLD OF INSTANT COMMUNICATIONS IS INSTANT DECISIONS, INSTANT CHANGING OF DECISIONS, AND INSTANT CHANGING OF POSITIONS. I THINK THAT WE OUGHT

WHY I (UNINTELLIGIBLE). I MADE IT VERY CLEAR WHY I WAS HERE.

Q. THE CHINESE WILL PROBABLY PUT PICTURES OF YOUR MEETINGS TODAY ON THE NEWSCASTS TONIGHT (TO PROJECT THE) FEELING THAT THINGS ARE BACK TO NORMAL. DO YOU THINK THEY ARE - RELATIONS BETWEEN U.S. AND CHINA - IN LIGHT OF YOUR VISIT?

A. OH NO, MY VISIT DOESN'T CHANGE THE STATUS OF THINGS AT ALL. IF THE CHINESE WISH (TO USE IT) FOR INTERNAL CONSUMPTION, THAT'S THEIR PRIVILEGE. THERE WERE PHOTOGRAPHERS HERE. I UNDERSTOOD THAT WHEN I GOT HERE. I KNOW THAT THE AMERICAN PRESS IS RESPONSIBLE ENOUGH TO REPORT MY VISIT FAITHFULLY AND I EXPECT THAT YOU WILL.

Q. YOU ANSWERED THE QUESTION IN STRICT TERMS ABOUT WHETHER YOU VIOLATED THE BAN ON HIGH-LEVEL VISITS IN A KIND OF TECHNICAL WAY. WHAT ABOUT THE SIGNAL IT SENDS? DO YOU THINK IT MAYBE INAPPROPRIATE FOR A PRETTY HIGH-RANKING MEMBER OF CONGRESS TO BE COMING HERE AND SAYING THE WRONG THING ABOUT OUR (RELATIONSHIP?)

A. ABSOLUTELY NOT. I THINK THAT MEMBERS OF CONGRESS OUGHT TO GO TO PLACES WHERE WE DON'T ENJOY THE BEST RELATIONS ON OCCASION, MEET WITH LEADERS, AND SUPPORT THE PRESIDENT WHEN WE DO (SO). I THINK IF WE DON'T, WE PROBABLY OUGHT TO STAY HOME. I DON'T THINK IT HELPS IN THAT INSTANCE.

CERTAINLY THERE IS A LONG HISTORY OF AMERICAN MEMBERS OF CONGRESS VISITING MANY PARTS OF THE WORLD WHERE WE HAVE HAD DIFFICULTIES, AND I THINK IT IS VERY HELPFUL. YOU KNOW IT IS VERY EASY TO DO NOTHING. IT IS VERY EASY TO ONLY TAKE POSITIONS WHEN THEY ARE CONVENIENT TO TAKE. AND I WAS FULLY AWARE THAT THERE WERE SOME THAT MIGHT CRITICIZE THE VISIT. AS A MATTER OF FACT I RECEIVED A LOT OF ENCOURAGEMENT AND A LOT OF PEOPLE THOUGHT IT WAS A FIRST-RATE IDEA THAT SOMEBODY FROM THE UNITED STATES SENATE CAME OVER HERE AND TOLD THESE PEOPLE WHAT WE THOUGHT. SO, I'VE DONE THAT AND I THINK THAT IT WAS CONSTRUCTIVE. IT WAS NOT CONFRONTATIONAL OR INFLAMMATORY ON EITHER SIDE.

Q. DID YOU BRING ANY MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT?

A. I'M NOT GOING TO TALK ABOUT THAT AT ALL. I DID DISCUSS THINGS WITH THE WHITE HOUSE, BUT NO I DID NOT CARRY SPECIFIC MESSAGES?

Q. DID YOU DISCUSS WITH THEM THE APPEARANCE OF WU'ER KAIXI AT (UNINTELLIGIBLE) BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE WHEN THE STUDENT LEADER WAS IN THE STATES?

A. I CAN'T ANSWER THAT QUESTION. ONE OF THE CONCERNS THAT WE DISCUSSED WAS THE NATURE OF THE

A. I'M AWARE OF ALL THOSE ISSUES. THEY DID NOT COME UP SPECIFICALLY, BUT OBVIOUSLY THAT WAS ONE OF THE CONCERNS THAT WAS EXPRESSED IN THE COURSE OF THE MEETING IN A GENERAL WAY AND THE THINGS THAT THEY ARE OBVIOUSLY CONCERNED ABOUT ARE THE COMMERCIAL AND MILITARY TECHNOLOGY BANS. WE CERTAINLY DISCUSSED THESE THINGS, YES.

Q. DID YOU GIVE THEM ANY INDICATION AT ALL WHETHER THERE MIGHT BE AN END OF THE SUSPENSION (OF CERTAIN CONTACTS AND EXCHANGES?)

A. NO. NUMBER ONE, I AM NOT IN THE POSITION TO DO IT. NUMBER TWO, IF I WAS, IT WOULD BE IMPROPER FOR ME TO DO IT. I TRULY BELIEVE THAT THE PRESIDENT AND HIS AMBASSADOR OUGHT TO CARRY OUT FOREIGN POLICY. I JUST DON'T THINK THAT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE. I DID NOT.

Q. (THE QUESTION ON TAPE IS NOT FULLY INTELLIGIBLE BUT WAS RELATED TO THE LIKELIHOOD COCOM WILL CHANGE ITS RULES FOR SALES OF TECHNOLOGY).

A. THAT IS A WHOLE SEPARATE ISSUE THAT IS NOT RELATED TO THESE EVENTS. I AM REALLY NOT IN A POSITION TO COMMENT. I DON'T KNOW. I'M JUST NOT FAMILIAR ENOUGH WITH THE STATUS OF THAT COCOM DISCUSSION AT THIS POINT.

Q. WHAT WAS WAN LI'S MANNER LIKE? DID HE ACT LIKE A MAN WITH POWER, A MAN WHO IS IN CHARGE. HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE HIM?

A. I WOULD LEAVE THOSE KIND OF SPECULATIONS TO YOU FREUDIANS IN THE PRESS. HE CAME ACROSS AS A MAN WHO KNOWS WHO HE IS, AND KNOWS HE HAS A POWERFUL POSITION. BUT (HE) WAS MOST GRACIOUS AND NOT OVERBEARING IN ANY WAY: VERY DIRECT IN HIS FEELINGS AND VERY PRECISE IN HIS RESPONSES, BUT OF GOOD HUMOR. I THINK, ALTHOUGH NOT LIKING A LOT OF THE THINGS THAT HE HEARD HE APPRECIATED THE FACT THAT I TOOK THE TIME TO COME AND TELL HIM.

Q. WHERE DO YOU STAND ON THIS ISSUE? ARE YOU FULLY SUPPORTING THE PRESIDENT?

A. AS OF THIS MOMENT, I AM. TOTALLY. I THINK THAT THIS RELATIONSHIP IS VERY IMPORTANT. I DON'T THINK THAT YOU CAN FORCE THIS KIND OF DELICATE FOREIGN POLICY THROUGH A SERIES OF STATUTES OR SENSE OF THE SENATE RESOLUTIONS AT A TIME WHEN THE SITUATION IS FLUID. I THINK THAT TO DO SO IN MANY WAYS CAN LIMIT THE FREEDOM OF ACTION OF THE PRESIDENT. AND I THINK THAT THIS IS NOT THE TIME. THAT IS NOT TO SAY THAT THE TIME MAY NOT COME. I MADE THAT POINT.

Q. IF AN AMERICAN BUSINESSMAN IS CONSIDERING COMING HERE TO DO BUSINESS, AND IS WEIGHING THE PROS AND

UNCLAS SECTION 09 OF 09 BEIJING 22327

THE TEMPERATURE IS ABOUT 68 AND THE HUMIDITY IS 2.

Q. CAN YOU DISCUSS MY QUESTION IN PERHAPS MORE GENERAL TERMS, MORE PHILOSOPHICAL TERMS. WHAT I AM REALLY GETTING AT, IN THE SITUATION NOW, ARE AMERICAN BUSINESS TIES IN CHINA IN THE INTEREST OF BOTH COUNTRIES AS (UNINTELLIGIBLE)?

A. THEY MAY BE IN CERTAIN AREAS. I WASN'T JUST QUIPPING WITH YOU. I REALLY THINK THAT THERE ARE A LOT OF ISSUES INVOLVED: THE TYPE OF TECHNOLOGY, THE TYPE OF CAPITAL THAT'S REQUIRED. WHETHER OR NOT THERE IS A DECIDED ADVANTAGE FOR AMERICA TO BE INVOLVED IN THAT PARTICULAR VENTURE RATHER THAN SOME FOREIGN COUNTRY, WHICH IS USUALLY WHAT HAPPENS IF WE DON'T. THERE ARE A LOT OF ISSUES INVOLVED HERE. SO I JUST CAN'T GIVE GENERAL ADVICE. THE COMMERCE DEPARTMENT, I KNOW, CARRIES ON EXTENSIVE DISCUSSIONS WITH AMERICANS. I DO KNOW THERE ARE AMERICANS NOW ACTIVELY PLANNING FOR NEW VENTURES HERE. WHETHER THEY WILL GO FORWARD OR NOT, TIME WILL TELL. I JUST DON'T KNOW.

[END OF CONFERENCE]

BT
#2327

NNNN

22/29